

Supply Notification No. 2521-EII/54, dated the 31st March, 1954, under sub section (2) of section 17 of the Requisitioning and Acquisition of Immovable Property Act, 1952. [Placed in Library. See No. S-165/54.]

GOVERNMENT OF PART C STATES
(AMENDMENT) BILL

Shri Dasaratha Deb (Tripura East): I beg to present fourteen petitions signed by fourteen petitioners in respect of my Bill further to amend the Government of Part C States Act, 1951.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. Speaker: I received at about 5 P.M. last evening a letter from the Chairman of the Council of States which reads as under:—

“My dear Mr. Speaker,

At the sitting of the Council of States yesterday (11th May 1954) a Member sought my permission to raise a question of privilege in respect of certain statements reported to have been made by Shri N. C. Chatterjee, relating to the passing by the Council of States of the Special Marriage Bill, in the course of a speech made by him at Hyderabad on the 10th May, 1954, as President of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha, at the concluding session of the Mahasabha and published in the local newspapers. According to the newspaper reports, Shri Chatterjee is alleged to have said that it was a ‘wonderful Parliament’ which was considering the Bill, and that the Upper House ‘which is supposed to be a body of elders seems to be behaving irresponsibly like a pack of urchins.’ Under my directions, the Secretary of the Council has written to Shri Chatterjee enquiring whether the statements attributed to him have been correctly reported in the newspapers.

As Shri N. C. Chatterjee happens to be a Member of the House

of the People, I am writing this to you.”

I think this note very much narrows down the issue. I do not even now express an opinion as I am keen that the procedure should once for all be settled after due consideration. It is not a matter of the prestige or dignity of this House or that House, and not a matter to be considered on party lines, or with a kind of feeling or pride for one's own House. Both the Houses together form Parliament, and the prestige of one House should be equally zealously and jealously guarded by the other House. But we want to be clear as to what the procedure should be for initiating proceedings, if at all they are thought to be necessary, in case a Member of one House is to be—I would not say charged—even approached for a preliminary explanation in a matter where the House feels that its dignity has been offended. Whatever decision is taken will apply equally to instances in both Houses, If we decide on a particular way, then so far as any Member of the Council of States making any allegations or aspersions, as this House may consider them to be, is concerned the procedure will be the same as in the case of a Member of the House of the People—as in this case—who is alleged to have made them. It is from this point of view that we have to look at the question and come to a decision. I may repeat what I said yesterday that as this is the first occasion which has arisen and as we have to build up some kind of proper procedure and tradition, we may discuss this matter in a dispassionate way and come to an agreed conclusion in the interests of the rights and privileges and also dignity of both the Houses of Parliament. It is not a question of this House against the other House. Let there be no misimpression on that question. Therefore, I had said that I would have the discussion postponed.

Now, in the light of this letter which I have received from the